

2
B registers in the first predetermined display area, and then transfers to a second predetermined display area, adjacent the first predetermined area, leaving a duplicate of itself in the first predetermined display area, and then if more than two parallel draws have been elected transfers from the second predetermined display area to a next adjacent third predetermined display area and continues in the same manner from area to adjacent area in sequence until the wild indicia has transferred to all the predetermined display areas, wherein if the wild indicia lands in a predetermined display area which has already received and retained an indicia which is identical to the wild indicia, the wild indicia changes to a different one of the players selected indicia which is not already present in that predetermined display area, before transferring to the next adjacent predetermined display area.

34. (New) The method as claimed in claim 28 wherein a prize is awarded if all the player's selected indicia appear distributed anywhere in the predetermined display areas.

REMARKS

I. AMENDMENT OF CLAIMS

The above claim set consists of amended claims 9-27 and newly added claims 28-34.

Misnumbered claims 1-19 have been renumbered 9-27 after a corresponding amendment to the numbering of the claims. The renumbered claims 9-27 have been also amended to be consistent with U. S. practice.

The newly added independent claim 28 and its dependent claims 29-34 define methods for playing a game on a gaming apparatus such as gaming machine originally claimed. No subject matter has been added that was not disclosed in the application as originally filed.

II. THE INFORMALITY REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner rejected the subject application because of the informalities such as misspelling words of "utilizing" and "gaming" in the specification and claims. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, the specification and claims have been amended to correct the typographical errors and to confirm with current U. S. practice.

Further, the Examiner wondered whether the "wild indicia" in claim 14 and the "wild ball" in claims 18-19 represent the same element structure. The "wild indicia" in claim 14 can be such numbers as disclosed in the specification page 3, lines 22-36. The "wild ball" in claims 18-19 is a wild ball feature as disclosed in a preferred embodiment in the specification page 4, lines 7- 16.

Therefore, the rejections based on the informalities should be withdrawn.

III. THE §112 REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 9-27 were found to be indefinite because the structural interrelation to present a complete and operative machine is not laid out. For example, according to the Examiner, claim 9, "a gaming machine having--- " no positive element structure recite in this claim.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 9 has been amended to recite the elements of a gaming machine that comprise a display means and a game control means.

Further, in claim 9, page 2, line 4, "those indicia" were found by the Examiner unclear and confusing at what they are referring to as a series of indicia or a group of indicia or a player indicia. The "those indicia" which have been generated by the game control means are referred to a series of indicia, as recited in claim 9, lines 5-6, " the game control means being arranged to generate a series of indicia".

To make it clear, "those indicia" have been amended to "the series of indicia".

In Claim 9, line 6-7, the phrase "predetermined number of matches of the player's indicia---- control means occur" was found by the Examiner to be awkwardly worded and confusing. Therefore, the Applicant amended the phrase into "predetermined number of matches occur between the player's selected indicia and the generated indicia".

Furthermore, according to the Examiner, the element structures, such as the machine comprising, further comprising and wherein consisting etc., are not recited in the claims. By the Amendment submitted herewith, the element structures have been recited in the claims to comply with the Examiner's suggestions.

Therefore, the rejections based on Section 112 should be withdrawn.

III. THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS ARE NEITHER ANTICIPATED BY NOR OBVIOUS OVER THE REFERENCES

The Examiner rejected claims 9-27 to be anticipated by or obvious over DIRE ET AL or MARGOLIN or KRAVITZ ET AL in view of LEAKE. As demonstrated herein, the claimed inventions are not anticipated by or obvious over the prior art. Therefore, the rejections in view of the references should be withdrawn.

A. THE PRESENT INVENTION

The present invention relates to gaming machines, known as slot machines, poker machines and one armed bandits, and methods for playing a game on a gaming apparatus.

The two most popular types of gaming machines either offer card games, particularly poker and variations of that game, or machines of the traditional and somewhat confusingly named poker machine style in which the display means comprises a set of rotatable reels, each reel carrying a plurality of symbols or a video simulation thereof known as video reel machines. Modern innovations particularly for a video reel machines include multi-line plays, wild cards, animation and other features designed to stimulate player interest.

Despite these innovations, the basic game remains the same and gaming manufacturers have been unable to devise a new game which is capable of being played on a stand alone gaming machine and which can generate the same level of player interest as card machines and poker machines.

Therefore, the present invention is principally concerned with providing a stand-alone gaming machine configured to play a game which has sufficient interest for a single player to play.

B. KRAVITZ PATENT AND LEAKE PATENT

The Kravitz and Leake Patents are directed to Keno or Bingo type of games involving the participation of numerous players.

These references, however, are diametrically opposed to the concept of the present invention because the game in the application is essentially played against the machine by a single player.

Accordingly, the present invention differs substantially over the references and the prior art does not disclose or even remotely suggest providing the gaming machines wherein the game is essentially played by a single player.

C. THE MARGOLIN PATENT

The Margolin refers to the playing of Keno on a video machine (Video Keno) as being unsatisfactory, because the Keno types of games are generally much slow for use as a game in a stand-

alone gaming machine and they supply insufficient excitement to persuade a player to play the game on a stand-alone gaming machine. Therefore, the Margolin seeks to provide a game of chance which provides more excitement than Keno.

The Margolin, however, teaches the different solution from that of the present invention. The Margolin teaches the concept of pattern Keno as a form of Way-Keno, which is very far removed from the ideas behind the present invention. The Margolin does not suggest in any way the concept of the present invention which relies on multiple parallel draws of numbers to players selected numbers.

D. THE DIRE PATENT

The Dire patent provides a stand-alone gaming machine and appreciates the problem of generating enough player excitement to cause the player to play the game. The solution taught by Dire is also a Keno type game, but is to increase the chances of the player winning the game. This is discussed in column 12, line 61 onwards as follows:

"In the same game, a player can win by selecting 1,2, 3, 4 or 5 winning numbers, he can win by predicting the position or sequence on winning indicators or he can win by any one of these numbers occurring more than once (up to five) on the reels activated.....

Thus, he can win by picking just one number and having five chances of that one number coming up on any of five wheels A, B, C, D or E. Therefore, the player may play several different ways with one game, winning on any of five wheels, winning on predicting or selecting positions or sequence if he picks more than one number, winning on occurrence of the same number or any combination of these".

In view of the above description, Dire essentially discloses playing of a single Keno game within enhanced opportunities for winning prizes.

In contrast, the present invention relates to a game where prizes are awarded for getting a certain number of matches with the indicia selected from the group but in which a plurality of Keno draws are made simultaneously to the same player selected indicia. Notably, it is the exact opposite of what would take place if someone at a Bingo or Keno hall played two or more games simultaneously. In the later case, there would be a plurality of sets of player's selections of balls to a single set of drawn numbers.

Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Dire patent which would result in arriving at the present invention.

E. SUB-CONCLUSION

In view of the above differences between the present invention and the references, claims 9-27 are not anticipated by the prior art. Further, there are no suggestions or motivations which would lead one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of the references to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, claims 9-27 are not obvious over the prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection in view of the references should be withdrawn.

Further, the newly added claims 28-34 define methods for playing games on gaming machines defined in claims 9-27. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place the case in condition for

final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that the personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted



Shahan Islam (Reg. No. 32,507)

Dated: March 15 , 2000

FRIEDMAN SIEGELBAUM LLP
Seven Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 992-1990 Ext. 191

F:\users\Anne\FBRICE\2703\Response.doc